



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,021	02/06/2006	Martin Moser	34874-135 NATL	7464
64280 7590 01/05/2011 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				
EXAMINER LINDSEY, MATTHEW S				
ART UNIT 2453		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 01/05/2011		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 and 22 have been finally rejected. For the reasons stated below, the rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant argues: "These statements are an inaccurate definition of a model and a mischaracterization of Chowdry. In Chowdry, the code used to represent the portlet (i.e. HTML) is the portlet" (pg 10, lines 2-4).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The definition of a model, provided by IEEE 100 The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition (hereinafter IEEE) is: "(4) A representation of one or more aspects of a system" (IEEE, pg 701, model (4)). Therefore, the HTML code representing the portlet, is a model of the portal.

4. Applicant further argues: "in the present claim 22, the 'model of an application component' is modified in response to the modification-request without modifying the application component" (pg 10, lines 5-7).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 22 does not recite the limitation "without modifying the application component". Furthermore, modifying the HTML code of a portlet will not modify the portlet until the code is rendered by a browser.

5. Applicant further argues that independent claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16 recite similar features and therefore are also allowable (pg 11, first full paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see above arguments.

6. Applicant further argues that the dependent nature of the dependent claims on allowable independent claims makes them allowable as well (pg 11, second paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see above arguments.

All arguments have been addressed; therefore all rejections are hereby maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krista Zele can be reached on (571) 272-7288. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL
12/22/2010

/Krista M. Zele/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453